



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,861	04/05/2004	Shlomo Navarro	25706	1807
7590 Martin D. Moynihan PRTSI, Inc. P. O. Box 16446 Arlington, VA 22215		05/02/2008	EXAMINER LEVY, NEIL S	
			ART UNIT 1615	PAPER NUMBER PAPER
		MAIL DATE 05/02/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/816,861	NAVARRO ET AL.
	Examiner NEIL LEVY	Art Unit 1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-60 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0256/05)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/14/05

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of group I, species;a combination of ar-turmerone, a sesquiterpene alcohol, a turmeric oleoresin solid residue" as a Terpene species, paper as a substance species & insect as a pest species; in the reply filed on 2/6/08, is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim10-60 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species & invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 2/6/08.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for reducing insect penetration, does not reasonably provide enablement for PREVENTION of penetration. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. PREVENTING is an absolute; no insect, or pest, of any species must be able to penetrate, given this language. The specification does not show 100% failure to penetrate..

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

NAKAMARU et al US005256377A with evidence of SU et al '82

.Packaged ozone decomposers (fig. 2) with the instant claimed terpenoids, although not the elected species, and substances usable in producing packaging materials, honey comb-like paper (col. 6, top) , is treated with a terpenoid, selected from a limited number , inclusive of turmerone (col. 5, top) & sesquiterpene alcohols (col. 4, bottom). 1-80% terpenoid is in a gel & evaporated onto the paper (col. 5, lines 30-32) & thus would be at a sufficient level to be capable of preventing pests from penetrating. Although NAKAMARU does not specify pesticidal effects, Su does, & shows repellency as the turmerone, exposed to air, becomes ar-turmerone (col. 1, p. 202, penultimate paragraph).

Air permeability is not adversely affected by the terpenoid coating the honeycomb (col. 5, lines 54-58) , thus the strength, water permeability, elasticity & transparency, less likely to be compromised, would also not be substantially different from untreated paper. The pest is immaterial to the composition of matter..

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by
WHALON et al US005843215A

Packaging paper board coatings of safer essential oil & plant ingredients(col. 1, top) prevent insect penetration (summary). Coatings incorporate Turmerone(table, col. 5, claim 12).The packages permit air passage (col. 5, lines 24-34). Concentration of active is 0.03-.3%\$ of the coating , the optimal level can be determined by the artisan (col. 5, lines 66-col.6, line 18), thus a sufficient amount to prevent penetration, without comprising integrity of the packaging material (transparency , & the other parameters of instant claims 3-7) would be attainable with minimal experimentation. 3 actives combined provide optimal efficacy, in terms of reduced cost, amounts & concentrations & increased # of pest species repelled(col. 6lines 44-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whalon et al US005843215A in view of ANTONY et al 2001 & Su '82.

Whalon (above) provides the instant active coated on paperboard packaging, but the combination is not specified. Antony shows turmeric in fact contains turmerones (p. 1,2). Su shows sesquiterpene alcohols also are present in turmeric (p. 290, paragraph 2).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made desiring to utilize safer pest control means, to use any of art recognized means, as of the plant & essential oils of Whalon disclosed as containing pest repellent compounds, capable of preventing insect penetration when used on packaging.

The use of turmeric by Whalon is shown to include the presence of turmerins, alcohols & oils, obvious to use in amounts determined by the one of ordinary skill in the art, to be effective insect repellents without damaging the packaging.

The amounts and proportions of each ingredient are result effective parameters chosen to obtain the desired effects. It would be obvious to vary the form of each ingredient to optimize the effect desired, depending upon the particular species and application method of interest, reduction of toxicity, cost minimization, enhanced, and prolonged, or synergistic effects.

Applicant has not provided any objective evidence of criticality, nonobvious or unexpected results that the administration of the particular ingredients' or concentrations provides any greater or different level of prior art expectation as claimed, and the use of ingredient for the functionality for which they are known to be used is not basis for patentability.

The instant invention provides well known old art recognized compounds, with well known art recognized effects, applied by well known art recognized methods to achieve improved control as is well known in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NEIL LEVY whose telephone number is 571-272-0619. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 7 AM to 5:30 PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL WOODWARD can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/NEIL LEVY/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615